



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,360	05/09/2001	Gopikrishna T. Kumar	10007291-1	4719

7590 04/03/2006  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/852,360

Applicant(s)

KUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffery Williams

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the Pre-Appeal Conference Request filed on 12/12/05. The office has reopened prosecution as indicated in the mailing of 1/31/2006.

Claims 1 – 13 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1 – 3, 4, 11 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aziz et al. (Aziz), U.S. Patent, 6,643,701.**

Regarding claim 1, Aziz discloses:  
*generating at the gateway module respective first session identifiers upon receipt of initial requests from the mobile communication devices at the gateway module and*

1 *transmitting the first session identifiers to the application program (8:15-22). Herein,*  
2 *Aziz discloses the use of SSL to establish connections for a session. As is evidenced*  
3 *by Kocher (Kocher et al., "The SSL Protocol Version 3.0"), Aziz discloses the sending of*  
4 *first session identifiers to the application program (Kocher, pg. 21 – 23).*

5 *associating the first session identifiers with corresponding second session*  
6 *identifiers from the application program at the gateway module (8:15-33). Again, Aziz*  
7 *shows the use of SSL, which entails the sending from the application program "second*  
8 *session identifiers" corresponding to the first session identifiers.*

9 *and in response to subsequent communications from the mobile devices to the*  
10 *application program, transmitting from the gateway module to the application program*  
11 *the second session identifiers that are associated with the first session identifiers of the*  
12 *mobile devices of the subsequent communications (8:25-32). Herein, Aziz discloses the*  
13 *subsequent communications from a device resulting in a SSL session resumption*  
14 *procedure, comprising the sending of the session identifiers that correspond to the*  
15 *identifiers of the session initiated by the mobile device.*

16  
17 Regarding claim 2, Aziz discloses:

18 *receiving requests of a first type from the mobile devices at the gateway module*  
19 *and transferring the first type requests to an authentication module that manages user*  
20 *authentication (8:66 – 9:5);*

21 *and when a user at a mobile device has not logged-in to the authentication*  
22 *module, transmitting a log-in prompt from the authentication module to the mobile*

1 *device in response to a request of the first type from the mobile device (9:3-5,23-29).*

2 Herein, Aziz discloses that when the server requires client authentication, the server  
3 requests (the client is prompted) that the client transmit log in information.

4  
5 Regarding claim 3, Aziz discloses:

6 generating at the authentication module respective authentication identifiers for  
7 the first session identifiers and associating the authentication identifiers with  
8 corresponding first session identifiers (2:11-15, 31-36; 8:66 – 9:5,23-29). Herein, Aziz  
9 discloses that resulting at the authentication module (“generating”), are authentication  
10 identifiers associated with the identifiers of the session.

11  
12 Regarding claim 4, it is the apparatus implementing the method of claim 1, and it  
13 is rejected, at least, the same reasons.

14  
15 Regarding claims 11 – 13, they are system implementing the method of claims 1  
16 – 3, and they are rejected, at least, for the same reasons. Furthermore, Aziz discloses  
17 a “mobile interface”, an interface to connect with a plurality of mobile devices (fig. 3).

18  
19 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20  
21 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
22 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2137

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Davis et al. (Davis), U.S. Patent 6,367,009.**

Regarding claim 5, it is a method substantially similar to the method of claim 1, and it is rejected, at least, for the same reasons. Furthermore, Aziz discloses applications of client – server technology within e-commerce and banking systems. Thus, Aziz makes clear that the sessions between a client and server are sessions between a client and a “merchant” application (1:40-55). Additionally Aziz, discloses that client devices can be wireless devices such as cell phones (7:4-18). However, Aziz does not explicitly disclose that a wireless device would establish a session with the gateway using wireless means, and therefore, that session identifiers are associated with wireless sessions.

Davis, in a substantially similar disclosure as Aziz, discloses that a wireless device (client) can utilize its wireless functionality to establish wireless sessions (fig. 3; 7:30-39, 8:44-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Davis within the system of Aziz. This would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have seen logical the use of a wireless device to establish a wireless session. Thus, the combination of Aziz and Davis discloses the use

1 of a wireless device to establish a SSL session wirelessly, and therefore, that the  
2 session identifiers would be wireless session identifiers.

3  
4 Regarding claim 10, it is the apparatus implementing the method of claim 5, and  
5 it is rejected, at least, the same reasons.

6  
7 **Claims 6 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**  
8 **the combination of Aziz and Davis, in view of Sparks et al., “Design and**  
9 **Production of Print Advertising and Commercial Display Materials Over the**  
10 **Internet”, U.S. Patent 6,167,382.**

11  
12 Regarding claim 6, the combination of Aziz and Davis does not disclose receiving  
13 checkout requests from the wireless communication devices at the gateway module and  
14 transferring the checkout requests to a wallet module that manages user authentication.  
15 Instead, the combination of Aziz and Davis discloses a generic system for establishing  
16 communications between a client and a server via a gateway (Aziz, figs. 2 and 6). The  
17 client and server each establish a secure session connection with an intervening relay.  
18 The relay then enables communications between the client and the server. The  
19 combination of Aziz and Davis discloses that this system is used as an improvement to  
20 various publicly available systems such as electronic commerce and shopping systems  
21 where the authentication and encryption of information is necessary (Aziz, col. 1, lines  
22 42-47; col. 3, lines 1,2). However, it was not the purpose of the combination of Aziz and

1 Davis to discuss the methods and features specific to the e-commerce and shopping  
2 systems. Thus, the combination of Aziz and Davis does not disclose methods such as  
3 receiving checkout requests, transmitting payment options, or using wallet identifiers.

4 Sparks discloses a system that features the electronic commerce methods of  
5 receiving checkout requests, transmitting payment options, and using wallet identifiers  
6 (Sparks, col. 2, lines 36-49; col. 17, lines 12-26).

7 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine  
8 electronic commerce features, such as those disclosed by Sparks, with the generic  
9 system of the combination of Aziz and Davis for establishing communications because it  
10 is obvious that a generic system designed to enhance electronic commerce (Aziz, col.  
11 1, lines 42-47) would need to features to enable electronic commerce.

12 Thus, the combination of Aziz, Davis, and Sparks discloses:

13 *receiving checkout requests from the wireless communication devices at the*  
14 *gateway module and transferring the checkout requests to a wallet module that*  
15 *manages user authentication* (Sparks, col. 2, lines 36-49);

16 *when a user at a wireless communications device has logged-in to the wallet*  
17 *module, transmitting payment options from the wallet module to the wireless*  
18 *communications device in response to a checkout request from the wireless*  
19 *communications device* (Sparks, figs. 3, 4, 9, 59, 60);

20 *when a user at a wireless communications device has not logged-in to the wallet*  
21 *module, transmitting a log-in prompt from the wallet module to the wireless*

1 *communications device in response to a checkout request from the wireless*  
2 *communications device (Sparks, figs. 3, 4).*

3  
4       Regarding claim 7, the combination of Aziz, Davis, and Sparks disclose:  
5       *generating at the wallet module respective wallet session identifiers for the*  
6 *wireless session identifiers and associating the wallet session identifiers with*  
7 *corresponding wireless session identifiers in a wallet session identifier table (Sparks,*  
8 *figs. 21 – 23).*

9  
10       Regarding claim 8, the combination of Aziz, Davis, and Sparks disclose:  
11       *in response to a payment request from a wireless communications device,*  
12 *transmitting the payment request from the gateway module to the merchant application*  
13 *(Sparks, col. 10, lines 37-64; Aziz, fig. 2);*

14       *disassociating the wireless session identifier from the corresponding merchant*  
15 *session identifier (Aziz, col. 2, lines 57-67; col. 6, lines 45-55). Unless session*  
16 *resumption procedures have been initiated by the client or the server, the session*  
17 *identifiers of the client are not re-associated with the corresponding session identifiers*  
18 *of the server, therefore, they are disassociated.*

19       *generating a new wireless session identifier for the wireless communications*  
20 *device when another initial request is received from the wireless communications device*  
21 *(Aziz, col. 6, lines 45-55). New sessions can be requested by the client.*

22

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Aziz, Davis, and Sparks implies *clearing inactive entries from the wallet session identifier table*. Electronic systems are not limitless in means for storage and operation. If unnecessary information was never cleared from memory, eventually such systems would reach their limits of storage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to clear inactive entries from the table in order to free and efficiently use a limited amount of memory.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

**See Notice of References Cited.**

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3 months** (not less than 90 days) from the mailing date of this communication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2137

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffery Williams  
AU: 2137



  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER